

Action Item

California Postsecondary Education Commission

Approval of the Minutes of the May 20, 2002, Meeting

MINUTES

California Postsecondary Education Commission

Special Meeting of May 20, 2002

**Commissioners
present** Alan S. Arkatov *Chair*
Carol Chandler, *Vice Chair*
William D. Campbell
Irwin S. Field
Susan Hammer
Lance Izumi
Kyo "Paul" Jhin
Robert L. Moore
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.
Evonne Seron Schulze
Rachel E. Shetka
Olivia K. Singh
Howard Welinsky

**Commissioner
absent**
Odessa P. Johnson
Melinda G. Wilson

Call to order Commission Chair Arkatov called the audio teleconference Commission Special Meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. He asked for a roll call of the Commissioners.

Roll call Executive Secretary Anna Gomez called the roll. All commissioners were present except Odessa Johnson and Melinda Wilson.

**Agenda Item I:
Approval for
Special Meeting** Chair Arkatov informed the Commissioners that certain procedural matters required attention, including the approval of the Commission Special Meeting.

The Administration's proposals for the Commission's 2002-03 budget in the May Revision necessitated the Commission to hold a special meeting. Such action was taken pursuant to Section 11125 of the Bagley-Keene Act due to the extraordinary circumstances causing a substantial hardship on the Commission. The Commission also believes that immediate action is required to protect the public interest.

It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the Commission formally recognize the necessity for a Commission Special Meeting to consider proposed legislation relating to the Commission's budget for 2002-03 and that such action is required to protect the public interest.

Information/Action Item	<p data-bbox="402 191 1430 344">Chair Arkatov reviewed the background of the May Revise budget proposals and the current status of the Commission budget. He drew attention to action taken by the Senate Budget Committee on Saturday night, May 18, 2002. The committee had unanimously voted to support the full restoration of the Commission's budget.</p> <p data-bbox="402 365 1430 518">Executive Director Fox introduced Vice Chair Carol Chandler. She thanked Commission staff and the Commissioners for the work done to date on the Commission budget, drawing attention to the information and data that had been prepared and testimony offered to the Senate committee.</p> <p data-bbox="402 539 1430 804">Executive Director Fox provided additional background information, drawing attention to the governor's proposal to reduce the Commission budget by \$2.8 million and eliminate 43.5 staff positions. The net effect of the proposed budget for the Commission would result in \$500,000 for operating expenses, plus three staff positions, two of which would be State-supported and one that would be a reimbursed position with federal funds. The latter would have the effect of requiring an \$8.4 million federal grants program to be administered by a single staff member.</p> <p data-bbox="402 825 1430 898">Director Fox went on to review the Senate budget committee action on May 18th, including the language that was rejected by the Senate committee.</p> <p data-bbox="402 919 1430 1146">Staff member Kevin Woolfork was asked to provide information relating to the timeline and processes anticipated before the State Budget will be approved. Mr. Woolfork provided the information and indicated that the Budget Conference Committee would be an "open" process, meaning that any budget item can be discussed or brought to the committee for discussion and action by any legislative member, not just those where differences occur between the Assembly and the Senate.</p> <p data-bbox="402 1167 1430 1356">Director Fox recognized Mr. Woolfork's efforts on behalf of the Commission and his diligence in keeping all apprised of the various stages of the budget process. He then talked about the next steps in the budget development process, including action by the Assembly budget subcommittee, which would hear the Commission budget on either Tuesday or Wednesday, May 21, or 22.</p> <p data-bbox="402 1377 1430 1451">Commissioners then discussed potential actions and activities that they might want to focus on for the remainder of the budget process review.</p> <p data-bbox="402 1472 1430 1625">Commissioner Singh suggested that staff put together a list of what would not be done if the Commission did not exist. Other Commissioners reinforced the suggestions, with Commissioner Schulze suggesting that such a statement, and related informational pieces must be succinct and precise.</p> <p data-bbox="402 1646 1430 1719">Mr. Fox reported to the Commissioners on materials that had already been provided to the Assembly staff and legislative committee members.</p> <p data-bbox="402 1740 1430 1848">Further discussion among the Commissioners focused on what individual action either had been or would be done in the near future to draw attention to the implications of the proposed Commission budget cuts.</p>
--------------------------------	---

Commissioner Moore indicated that what needs to be communicated effectively is that the Commission provides “value added” services and information and what the Commission can do that is not being done by other bodies.

Chair Arkatov said that the message that needs to be communicated to the Legislature and others should reflect the tasks and responsibilities as well as core attributes provided by the Commission.

Members further discussed those attributes that they felt were important attributes of the Commission. Commissioner Schulze drew attention to the independent voice and analysis function of the Commission and strongly suggested that such a voice should not be lost. Commissioner Hammer voiced a similar perspective and reinforced the need to identify those functions, attributes, and values that would be lost.

Cost effectiveness and savings also were identified by Vice Chair Chandler and others as being an important attribute of Commission activity. Attention was drawn to the program review and facility review processes and the aspects of quality, costs, duplication of effort, and financial implications inherent in these reviews.

Additional discussion focused on Commissioner communication with legislators to seek support for the restoration the Commission budget. Staff is to provide additional information to Commissioners. Mr. Moore was to review the material prior to it being sent to Commissioners and offer suggestions, if necessary, to strengthen that material. This preparation was to be completed by late afternoon.

Commissioner Irwin Field drew attention to the fact that much of the work being done by the Commission will need to be done by someone else if the Commission does not exist. That information needs to be communicated to the Administration and Legislative leadership. Executive Director Fox indicated that much work has been completed that documents statutory responsibility and staff necessary to complete them. Further discussion centered on stakeholders and what level of support and expressions of support in writing might be obtained. Efforts were initiated or reinforced to seek support from as many stakeholder groups as feasible.

Various strategies were discussed by the Commissioners as to the next steps to be taken with regard to a meeting follow-up.

Chair Arkatov reminded the commissioners that an Executive Committee meeting on June 2 would be held at 11 in the morning and that all Commission members were welcome.

Executive Director Fox thanked commissioners in attendance at the Commission Special Meeting for their participation and continuing support.

Adjournment The Commission meeting adjourned at 10:21 a.m.
